DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 976 95 EA 007 171

TITLE	Development and Evaluation of Planning Program Implementation: A Process Guide. Far West Series in Instructional Planning.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 75
NOTE	21p.; Related documents are EA 007 168-172
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; Educational Administration; Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; Group Dynamics; *Planning; *Process Education; *Program Development; Program Planning

ABSTRACT

Providing a summary record of the development and evaluation of an incomplete product, this status report discusses a training program to aid school staff in producing implementation plans for programs. Consisting of printed materials, guidelines for considering the aspects of program design with implications for program implementation are presented. The planning process, proposed as one of a variety of task approaches, assumes that planning is a group process involving the responsible decision-makers, that staff members have performance capability, and that the chosen program meets a pressing need. The unit is composed of six sessions, of which the first two concentrate on placing implementation in context with overall instructional program planning. Sessions 3, 4, and 5 take up the detailed processes of implementation, and the final session is a review of the planning steps. The product evaluation report suggests that this product is incomplete and needs further development. (Author/DW)

ED106976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Development and Evaluation of

Planning Program Implementation: A Process Guide

in the

Far West Series in Instructional Planning

February 1975

Educational Management Program

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, California 94103

EA 007 171

This report was prepared by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, a public nonprofit organization funded in part by the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the funding agency nor endorsement by any other government agency.

FOREWORD

This report is intended to provide a summary record of the development and evaluation of one of the products produced by the Educational Management Program. The product is not, however, considered by the Laboratory to be complete and ready for sale to potential users by the Laboratory at this time. Thus, this report should be viewed primarily as a status report for a product that cannot be finished now because the necessary additional funds are not presently available.

There are two factors that contributed to the unfinished development of the product. First, planning for the actual introduction in classrooms of an instructional program is a task that is very much constrained by specific circumstances that exist in the school or district where the program is to be used. How the task should and can be done is also greatly dependent on the extent to which prior tasks have been completed satisfactorily. It is even possible that there is no kind of preparation that can be offered to school staffs in this area, except as it is designed by someone who can appreciate the unique problems in a particular school setting.

Second, the approach taken in the conceptualization of this unit was a marked departure from that followed in the development of other units that had been undertaken by the Educational Management Program. This was, in large part, a reflection of the issues discussed above. The effort was made to inform school staffs about general processes that could be useful when applied to unique situations. The approach seems a correct one, but the creation of materials that will lead people to appreciate and apply new processes is much more challenging than the teaching of new knowledge or skills.

The fact that the unit is incomplete may be seen, in part, as testimony to the greater difficulty of the undertaking. The progress made in the development of the unit indicates that with additional time and effort it could be made quite useful in broadening the experience and knowledge of school staffs in an important area.

Even though the product is incomplete according to accepted Laboratory standards, it is not necessary to conclude that it should not be disseminated through other channels for use in particular situations. It seems likely that skilled consultants accustomed to working with school staffs in a facilitative way may find the unit to be a very useful resource for increasing their efficiency. The unit may also be of value to school staffs in assessing their own progress in the complicated process of planning new instructional programs that will better meet the needs of their students.

The unit, accompanied by this status report, will be made available for such uses through ERIC, and other appropriate procedures for placing it in the public domain will be sought. Additional development work will be done if opportunities for such effort arise.

Richard W. Watkins
Program Director
Educational Management Program

Development and Evaluation of

Planning Program Implementation: A Process Guide

Planning Program Implementation is one of six sets of materials developed to increase the skill, knowledge and understanding of school personnel in the area of instructional planning and management. Instructional planning is defined generally as that area of educational administration that is concerned with providing educational opportunities for children. This area may be further defined as involving the establishment of instructional program purposes, the design and implementation of programs, and the evaluation of the instructional programs. This unit is directed to the second of these three areas. It differs from the other units in this series, however, in that it places much greater emphasis on familiarization with and use of particular kinds of processes in a systematic way than on the development of specific skills or imparting knowledge.

Intended Users

The materials of Planning Program Implementation are designed for those school personnel who are directly concerned with planning for the introduction of a chosen or developed instructional program in classrooms. The specific role titles of such staff will vary from district to district, but most often will include building principals, department heads, district curriculum specialists, and classroom teachers. The unit is designed primarily for, and will likely be most useful to, staff members drawn from a single school, or group of schools, who are faced with a common instructional problem. It may also be useful to groups composed of staff from different schools or districts, as in university graduate courses or inter-district workshops; but this will result in a somewhat artificial use of the material, and is not likely to be

as successful as would be the case with a more homogeneous group.

Product Purposes and Description

The goal of this unit is to aid school staff to produce implementation plans for their programs or projects that are useful, immediately applicable, and sufficiently detailed so that those who have to work with the plans will understand what staff members are to do, and why. The unit itself consists of printed materials which present guidelines for considering the aspects of program design that have implications for program implementation, with particular attention to the details that need attention after a specific program has been chosen. The text emphasizes that the planning process proposed is only one of a variety of ways that the task might be approached, and that the unit should be used as a guide to thoughtful planning, rather than a book of rules or steps that must be followed. The unit is based on the assumptions (a) that planning to implement a program is a group process that must involve those who will have responsibility for actual implementation in making the decisions about the programs, (b) that these staff members already have the capability for performance of the necessary planning tasks with only the direction provided by general guidelines, and (c) that the particular program to be implemented has already been chosen to meet a pressing problem faced by a school.

It is presently judged that an actual implementation plan might be developed using the unit in six sessions of about three hours each. It is anticipated, however, that there will be considerable variation in the time requirements from one situation to another depending on the characteristics of the group and the amount of effort that has been devoted to the prior steps of program planning. The first two sessions are devoted to placing implementation planning in the proper context of overall instructional program planning. Reference is made in these sessions to other materials of potential value if

the planners conclude that the first stages of program planning have not been sufficiently completed to permit effective program implementation planning. The third, fourth and fifth sessions take up the detailed processes of implementation planning. The final session is directed to a review of the steps that should logically follow this planning stage, but the session is intended to be no more than a listing and brief discussion of the later steps.

A list of the tasks to be covered during the use of the unit is presented below, organized by the recommended structure of the six sessions.

Session I
- Select planning group leader
- Define problem to be addressed
- Select program objectives

Session II
- Design or select a program/project to meet objectives

Session III
- Develop implementation plan
  - Write implementation group mission statement
  - Determine personnel requirements, including preservice and inservice training
  - Determine material, equipment and other physical requirements

Session IV
- Develop implementation plan (cont'd)
  - Determine school readiness
  - Plan staff selection
  - Plan purchasing schedule
  - Plan staff orientation

Session V
- Develop implementation plan (cont'd)
  - Determine costs
  - Determine sequence of implementation tasks
  - Establish timeline
  - Arrange independent review of plan

Session VI
- Develop evaluation plan
- Secure approval of plan and budget
- Initiate and operate program plan
- Conclude plans
- Evaluate program
- Determine program future

An appendix to the unit sets forth the crucial features of the design of an instructional program in experience based career education, which can be

used as a basis for program implementation planning in the event that users of the unit have not yet, in fact, chosen a particular program to meet an identified need. Users of the Planning Program Implementation unit are not encouraged to make use of this appendix, however, unless there seems no alternative way that a group can arrive at a consensus on a program design that would be more meaningful or more realistic in their situation. Two other short appendices describe the use of Task Work Sheets and provide a glossary of terms used in the unit. Additionally, there is a comprehensive bibliography that includes references to publications and other kinds of training materials that might be useful in staff training.

The role of the coordinator or group leader in the use of the unit is essentially one of facilitator of the group's process; success in the role is probably largely dependent on personal style, knowledge about individual participants, and familiarity with the situation within which those using the training unit are operating. The leader is to be chosen from the planning group by the group members, and there is no separate set of materials intended specifically for the coordinator or leader although some suggestions are given to him in the unit materials.

Product Development and Testing

As the Educational Management Program focus on training evolved from work in an earlier program, and from analysis of school staff needs, three general areas of program planning were defined: establishing program purposes, designing programs, and evaluating the programs. Continuing analysis and conceptualization indicated that a crucial area that had been omitted initially was that of planning for actual implementation in the classrooms of the programs that had been designed or implemented. It became increasingly clear that the design or choice of a program that would meet the identified needs, goals and objectives for a program would not be sufficient. Often,

well-designed programs were weakened, or in some cases not actually provided in the classrooms, because insufficient attention had been given to the many problems that might be encountered in installation of the program.

The need for a training unit in the Educational Management Program directed specifically to the tasks of implementing programs in schools was first stated by Banathy and Jenks in 1970, and general plans for the development of such a unit included in the proposed scope of program work for 1971 (Far West Laboratory, September 1970). Preparation of a more detailed statement of plans on which actual development work could be based had to be delayed until late in 1971 (Jenks, 1971). The tentative objectives of the proposed unit defined at that time included: conceptual knowledge of varieties of management styles and their implications for school staffs who must implement programs; knowledge of the elements of a good implementation plan, skills in assessment and choice of a particular leadership style and in the development of a specific implementation plan; the provision of techniques to assess existing management styles in operation in a given school or district; and guidelines to determine organizational requirements.

The program staff issued a sub-contract with an external agency (Problem Solving, Inc. of San Rafael, California) to assist in the development of a prototype of a unit designed to achieve these objectives. This consulting firm was chosen because the president of the firm had specialized in assisting schools and other agencies in the development and installation of innovative programs; he had extensive knowledge of the problems and pit-falls in this process, gained from work in a variety of school settings.

Testing of Draft Prototype

A draft of the prototype version was used in three class meetings of a course at California State University, San Francisco, in late March 1972. There was a "debriefing" of the students following the use of the unit, and

the faculty member responsible for the course prepared a very thoughtful critique of the unit (Rutter). The following excerpts from the critique are presented because this prototype test had an important influence on the transition from a skill-knowledge oriented unit to one that is a process guide.

> "Many people in the Seminar indicated that they were pleased to have had this experience. None indicated the opposite. The suggestions which follow are in addition to the ones made by the Seminar on April 4th....My strongest reaction to the document itself is very positive in that it systematizes the process of program implementation. The one through twenty points listed on page 9 and detailed in the remainder of the draft makes it possible to learn how to implement a program. The twenty step analysis is a sound one and much needed in Educational Administration. Typical literature in the field would include bits and pieces of the twenty steps, but not in the complete and consistent way set forth by Brokes."
>
> "To make it a more effective training document, I would suggest adding some of the concepts presented orally that are not adequately developed in the draft as follows:
>
> 1. Extrinsic and intrinsic motivators.
> 2. Zero games vs. non-zero games.
> 3. Working the problem and not the people.
>
> The class presentations in those areas (and others) were helpful in developing a clearer conceptualization of participative management. This type of management requires a high level of human relations skills and know-how. Any strengthening of the H-R factors would be a gain. I also think that a bit more content should be developed regarding resistance to change and how to deal with it....At the subsequent meeting of the seminar, the suggestion was made that the document did not provide quite enough inputs to give at least one student the confidence he felt he needed in the general area of coping with resistance. I had the feeling that many others agreed."

Following this prototype test, a one day critique session was held by the development staff and the following external specialists:

Dr. Don Barbee
Department of Educational Administration
California State University

Dr. Richard Snow
School of Education
Stanford University

Mr. Roger Falge
Marin County Schools Office
San Rafael, California

The unit objectives and content were quite extensively revised based on the results of the prototype test and external critiques. Thirteen rather specific objectives related to steps in the implementation planning process

were defined tentatively. The rationale for the content revisions, and the newly defined objectives were described in a progress report submitted to the funding agency (Educational Management Program, April 1973). The following kinds of content revisions were made:

1. Two problem simulations were developed for potential use by trainees.
2. Didactic material was revised to place more emphasis on group process problems.
3. A manual of procedures was developed to assist trainee groups.

Target Audience Assessment

In order to obtain more information about the characteristics and needs of the school staffs for whom the unit was intended, a one and a half day planning meeting was arranged for eight administrators from the San Rafael, California School District in March 1973. Participants were asked to read the revised unit in advance, but were also asked not to refer to it during the meeting. They were, in effect, asked to undertake the task of planning for program implementation on their own. The unit materials were used only to describe an approach to their planning task and to suggest important issues to be considered. Although the group was composed of both elementary and secondary administrators, they chose to plan for the implementation of a new early childhood program. The following conclusions about the planning process were reached, based on direct observation of the process by program staff and on written comments and questionnaire responses made by the participants in the training session:

1. The group, though experienced and competent administrators, mixed the "what" and "how" of planning. Goals and process were continually confused, apparently with no recognition by the participants that this was happening.
2. The participants used terminology related to implementation planning

in quite different ways, resulting in some confusion and disagreement that delayed progress in the development of a plan.

3. The group was not prepared to deal with the problem of establishing a budget for the project being planned, or to consider the relation between costs and alternative program characteristics.
4. The person chosen by the group as a leader, because he was quite familiar with the program being planned, was not experienced in the planning processes, and so was unable to keep the group on target or to facilitate its work.
5. The implementation plan produced during the planning session was judged by the staff observers to be inadequate as a basis for actually starting up a program.
6. The participants thought the unit materials to be appropriate to their ability and experience, and viewed the emphasis on participative management very positively. As a group, the participants varied in their opinions about the need for feedback in the unit, or self-tests, and about whether a group leader chosen by the participants was being given too much responsibility for the success or failure of the planning activities.

The experience gained from this use of the unit, and the increased understanding of potential target audiences led to another revision of the goals and objectives. A description of the revised unit was presented in a second progress report submitted to NIE (Educational Management Program, September 1973). This report also includes a discussion of the plans for and results of a field test of the revised unit.

Preliminary Form Testing

Two test sites had been scheduled for the summer of 1973 using classes

of educational administrators at two different institutions. The enrollment at one college was insufficient to justify conducting the course, however, so that only one test site at California State University, San Francisco, was available. There were seventeen participants in the field test, all of whom were working for a master's degree in educational administration. About two-thirds of the students were in preservice training for elementary or secondary positions; the remainder of the group included a curriculum specialist, a counselor, a special education consultant and a school administrator. In short, the group was very heterogeneous with respect to prior experience, and could not in any way be seen as sharing a common instructional planning problem.

The program staff introduced the unit, and divided the class into three groups. Each group was asked to choose its own leader and to proceed through the unit as designed. A simulated problem was provided by the staff to each group, if the group wished to use it. After these arrangements had been made, the program staff acted only as observers of the process, and did not intervene further. No group actually used the simulated problem as a basis for the implementation planning; each group identified a problem of its own, but these problems themselves were in some sense simulated since the group members could not share a common problem.

The time allowed for this unit within the context of the total course prevented the collection of information about specific gains resulting from the use of the unit. The opinion data and ratings of the unit did indicate markedly increased awareness of the importance of implementation planning, reflected participant judgments that the tasks outlined for the improvement in implementation planning were useful, and reported increased confidence that participants could perform the tasks required for successful planning. The participants believed that the plans they produced would be useful as a basis for introducing a program in a school, and rated the training materials, on the

average, somewhat higher than moderately useful (on a seven point scale) in increasing their ability to do good planning. The participants also said that they thought the material needed more examples and clarification, that more attention should be given to the way the group leader is chosen, and that a number of pages were unnecessarily confusing and should be rewritten.

External Specialist Review

The unit was again heavily edited and portions rewritten, and the separate materials on how to conduct the training workshop were incorporated with the actual workshop materials. This revised unit was then sent, with supplementary information about the history of its development, purposes, and so on, to five external reviewers. The reviewers were chosen to represent a diversity of backgrounds and experience. They were:

Dr. Roger Kaufman
U.S. International University
San Diego, California

Dr. Thomas Lorch
Director of Instructional Services
Tamalpais Union High School District
Larkspur, California

Dr. Herb Salinger
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Hanlon Tharp
Principal
San Rafael Elementary School District
San Rafael, California

Mr. Joseph Wardlaw
Director of Development
Vallejo Unified School District
Vallejo, California

The reviewers were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. What about the need for the content of the unit by school staffs?
2. Do the goals and objectives represent important outcomes?
3. How well does the unit address the objectives?
4. Is the organization of the content coherent?
5. What about the format of the unit?
6. Do you have any specific suggestions for changes, additional materials, needed directions, exercises, models, etc.?
7. Any other concerns?

As expected, these reviewers responded in a variety of ways, including extensive interlinear comments in the unit itself. A former program staff member was asked to organize the comments and responses in a comprehensible summary document for use by the program staff in possible further revision of the unit (York). This summary report had 17 pages, and cannot be easily summarized further for the purpose of this report. Half of the report dealt with the responses to the first six questions listed above, and the remainder with suggestions for page by page changes, drawn largely from the interlinear comments. The responses of the reviewers were carefully attended to in making additional revisions to the unit. The report is essentially a staff working paper, on file in the program archives, and it is not included here because it was based on a version of the unit no longer being used.

Revised Preliminary Form Testing

When revision of the unit was completed, arrangements were made for another field test of the unit conducted in August 1974. For this field test, six staff members from the Mountain View, California High School District came to the Laboratory for five successive half day working sessions. This group was faced with the problem of planning for the introduction of a new career education program in one of the high schools in the district. The decision had been made by the district to install such a program in the school, and staff members had contacted the Laboratory EBCE program staff for assistance in preparation for the program. In a very real sense, this group provided an opportunity to test the unit in what was very nearly the optimum situation for which it was intended.

When the planning meetings started, it was expected that this group would have an implementation plan at the conclusion of the fifth session. When they had completed the five work sessions, however, they said that they were not satisfied with the plan they had and would prefer to do additional work on it.

They agreed to send their final plan to the program staff at a later time, but the plan has not yet been received; it seems most likely that with the opening of school in the fall the planning group simply did not have time to assemble and work more on the plan. As discussed below, the planners' dissatisfaction with the plan produced in no way indicates that the group was dissatisfied with the training or group planning experience. On the contrary, they appeared to believe it quite useful, and some measure of its value to them may be indicated by the fact they they recognized the inadequacy of the plans they produced. The comments made at the time they were discussing their plan indicated that one of the major outcomes of the planning process was an awareness that the task of designing the program to be introduced in the school had simply not been done with any degree of thoroughness. Much of the time that was to be devoted to planning for the implementation of the program was in fact devoted to a very hasty design of major features of the program to be introduced. The consensus of the group was that this had been very useful to them, but the question of whether the group ever produced either a satisfactory program design or a usable implementation plan remains unanswered.

Responses to open ended and limited response opinion questions about the planning process and the materials in the training unit showed that the group found the unit and experience valuable to them, felt the unit would be of value to school staffs and believed they had learned a great deal as a result of using the unit. They also said they thought that users of the unit needed more directions and more examples to show what was to be accomplished at the conclusion of each step of the planning sequence. Additionally, they recommended that future users of the unit have a program design available to them before planning for the implementation of the program, that sections be

rewritten more in outline form with an introduction describing the intended outcomes for each section, that the task of preparing a mission statement be clarified, and that the proposed sequencing of planning tasks as presented in the unit be reconsidered.

Preparation of Current Version

The unit was again edited and partially rewritten during the fall of 1974, and used one more time. This most recent use of the unit was not designed as a field test; rather, arrangements had been made by another division of the Laboratory for members of the central office of a school district to use all of the Educational Management products in sequence. The motivation of the group for participating in these sessions was in part external. The problem chosen by the group as the "theme" for all the training was not predominantly an instructional one; they were concerned with increasing the usage by students of audio-visual and other materials in a learning resource center located in each of the high schools in the district. The Laboratory staff member who had been primarily responsible for the development of the Planning Program Implementation unit was the coordinator for all of these training sessions; a staff member from the Educational Management Program attended the meetings, when PPI was used, as an observer but no field test data were obtained in this instance.

At the conclusion of the second session using PPI it became evident that this group, working on the problem they had defined, and under the conditions of training could not proceed very successfully with the unit as designed. In the remaining three sessions (this version was designed for only five three hour sessions), the coordinator took on a much more directive role than specified in the unit, using the unit as a guide and resource for the training. Used in this way, the group produced a document that should probably be quite

useful for them as a detailed or annotated list of major tasks to be accomplished in progressing toward their particular objectives, with at least tentative milestone dates associated with the tasks. A copy of this plan has been included in the program file, but at best it can be considered only as a draft program design.

The present version of the unit represents a revision of the unit used in this last situation. The major change introduced was to devote a larger portion of the time (essentially two three-hour sessions) to placing implementation planning in the context of overall instructional planning, with cautions and directions in the event that the planning group has not given enough consideration to instructional program purposes and design.

Conclusion

The extensive review, prototype testing and revision processes have indicated that this unit is directed to very important objectives which are crucial to the final success of instructional program planning and installation. There also seems to be merit in approaching the implementation planning task using a process guide, but it is not yet evident in detail what is accomplished using the unit, or how much the accomplishments are related to increased appreciation and understanding of processes and what part is related to increased knowledge, or awareness of lack of knowledge. Additionally, the need for and the role of a group leader or external coordinator is not clear, nor is there evidence that the use of this process guide will accomplish the stated goal of enabling school staff to produce an implementation plan that can be used by other school staff.

The decision has been made by the Far West Laboratory management group that an interim inventory of this unit in its present form should not be produced and sold by the Laboratory through its Educational Services Division.

At present, there are no funds available for continued or new development work to achieve the goals to which the unit is directed, and it seems unlikely that such funds would become available in the foreseeable future. The best dissemination strategy under these circumstances seems to be that of submitting the unit for inclusion in the ERIC system, thus making it available in the public domain without any stated product claims.

A small inventory of the unit will be retained by the Laboratory for possible staff use, or for additional field testing, should the opportunity arise.

REFERENCES

Banathy, B.H. and Jenks, C.L., "Conceptualization and plans--instructional planning and management system," October 1970.

Educational Management Program, "Program Implementation Planning Training Unit: preliminary form development and testing," Milestone report submitted to NIE, April 1973.

_____, "Program Implementation Planning Training Unit progress report," Milestone report submitted to NIE, September 1973.

_____, "End of year progress report on 1973 scope of work," November 1973, pp. 69-70.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, "Annual 1972 budget justifications," pp. A-48 ff., Berkeley, Ca., September 1971.

_____, "Contractor's request for 1971 funding," pp. 51-53, Berkeley, Ca., September 1970.

Futter, I.C., "Critique: 'A proposed program implementation planning system,'" Memorandum to C.L. Jenks, April 17, 1972.

Jenks, C.L., "The Development of a Training Unit Planning Program Implementation," Draft paper, November 1971.

York, L.J., "Summary of external reviews of Planning Progam Implementation unit," July 1974.